Docket No.: 59629-8011.US01
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Yi-Hsung Pang

Application No.: 10/679,051	Confirmation No.: 5322
Filed: October 2, 2003	Art Unit: 3683
For: Braking Buffer And Turning Enhancement Device For Motorcar	Examiner: Thomas J. Williams

AMENDED APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 C.F.R. § 41.37), dated March 29, 2008, Applicant submits this Amended Appeal Brief. The Amended Appeal Brief complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v) by identifying the reference characters for each limitation in the summary of claimed subject matter.

This brief contains items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. The complete Table of Contents follows.

CONTENTS

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST 1

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS 1

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS 1

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS 1

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER 1

A. Overview of the Invention and Prior Art 1
  1. The Invention 1

B. Independent Claims on Appeal 2
  1. Claim 12 2
  2. Claim 26 2
  3. Claim 27 3
  4. Claim 28 3

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL 4

A. The Issues on Appeal 4

VII. ARGUMENTS 4

A. Legal Standards for Obviousness 4

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) 6
  1. The Rejection of Claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky is Improper Because Carlson and Palowsky Teach Away from the Claims 6
    a. U.S. Patent No. 3,614,126 to Carlson 6
    b. U.S. Patent No. 3,501,167 to Palowsky 8
    c. Claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, and 28 8
    d. Claim 27 9
  2. The Rejection of Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky and further in view of Hanel is Improper 9
    a. Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 9
  3. The Rejection of Claims 23-25, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky and further in view of Powers is Improper 10
    a. Claims 23 and 24 10
    b. Claims 29 and 30 10
    c. Claim 25 11

CLAIMS APPENDIX **13**

EVIDENCE APPENDIX **18**

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX **19**

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Yi-Hsung Pang.

II. RELATED APPEALS, INTERFERENCES, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Appellant is not aware of other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which would have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

The application was initially filed with 11 claims. Claims 1-11 were canceled and claims 12-30 were added in the amendment and response to the Office Action filed on July 13, 2004.

Claims 12-30 are pending in this application. Claims 12-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 12-30 are the subject of the present appeal. The text of these claims is set forth below in the Claims Appendix.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been filed subsequent to a Final Office Action dated September 25, 2007.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A. Overview of the Invention and Prior Art

1. The Invention

Applicant's invention discloses a braking buffer and a turning balance device for a motorcar. The braking buffer device, affixed longitudinally along the base of a car, comprises a weighty drum with a fixed mass and a recovery spring. During braking of the car, the push of the momentum of the car is transferred to the weighty drum to decrease the braking distance and the pushing effect felt by people in the car. The turning balance device is affixed horizontally under the base of the rear of the car. When the car is turning, the momentum caused by the outward centrifugal force transfers to the weighty drum so that the turning radius decreases and the turning is more balanced. The present invention increases stability and safety. [Specification, Abstract]

B. Independent Claims on Appeal

The rejected independent claims are directed to various apparatus for providing a more comfortable experience for passengers in a car during the process of braking and/or turning of the car. The independent claims are described below.

1. Claim 12

Claim 12 is directed toward an apparatus for a motorcar. The apparatus includes a guiding axis coupled from the front to the back of the motorcar. [Specification, 3:3-9, FIG. 1 reference character 108] The apparatus further includes a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar. [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 114, 5:2-3, 5:6-9, 3:3-9]

Further, the weighty drum has a predefined resting position on said guiding axis wherein said weighty drum moves toward said front of said motorcar when brakes of said motorcar are engaged while said motorcar is in motion and said weighty drum returns to said predefined resting position after said motorcar slows down or comes to a stop. [Specification, 5:9-6:13, 5:3-5]

The apparatus further includes a recovery device tending to bias the weighty drum to the predefined resting position. [Specification, 3:10-11]

2. Claim 26

Claim 26 is directed toward an apparatus for a motorcar. The apparatus includes a guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said motorcar, said guiding axis being tilted downward towards said front of said motorcar. [Specification, 3:3-9, 6:23-7:2, FIG. 1 reference character 108]

The apparatus further includes a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confines motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar. [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 114, 5:2-3, 5:6-9, 3:3-9] Further, the weighty drum has a predefined resting position upon said guiding axis positioned towards said back of said motorcar. [Specification, 5:9-6:13, 5:3-5]

The apparatus further includes a recovery device tending to bias said weighty drum to said predefined resting position. [Specification, 3:10-11]

3. Claim 27

Claim 27 is directed toward an apparatus for a motorcar traveling in a longitudinal direction. The apparatus operates to temporally transfer longitudinal momentum to a weighty drum that is biased to the rear of said motorcar when braking thereby tending to increase the comfort and safety of the car. [Specification, 2:6-13, 5:9-6:13]

The apparatus further circumferentially surrounds a portion of a guiding axis equal to a length of said braking buffer device such that said braking buffer device is capable of moving along said guiding axis. [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 114, 5:2-3, 5:6-9, 3:3-9]

4. Claim 28

Claim 28 is directed toward a car suitable for the transportation of passengers and cargo. The car includes a left braking buffer device, comprising a left guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car; [Specification, 2:27, 3:3-9, 9:1-6] a left weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said left guiding axis equal to a length of said left weighty drum such that said left weighty drum is capable of moving along said left guiding axis, said left guiding axis confining motion of said left weighty drum between said front and said back of said car, [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 114, 5:2-3, 5:6-9, 3:3-9] said left weighty drum having a first predefined resting position upon said left guiding axis; [Specification, 5:3-5] and a left recovery device tending to bias said left weighty drum to said first predefined resting position. [Specification, 3:10-11]

The car further includes a right braking buffer device, comprising a right guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car; [Specification, 2:28, 3:3-9, 9:1-4] a right weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said right guiding axis equal to a length of said right weighty drum such that said right weighty drum is capable of moving along said right guiding axis, said right guiding axis confining motion of said right weighty drum between said front and said back of said car, [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 114, 5:2-3, 5:6-9, 3:3-9] said right weighty drum having a second predefined resting position upon said right guiding axis; [Specification, 5:3-5] and a right recovery device tending to bias said right weighty drum to said second predefined resting position. [Specification, 3:10-11]

The car further includes a rear turning enhancement balance device, said rear turning enhancement device intended to decrease centrifugal motion of front wheels of said car and the momentum of the weighty drum enhances the turning of said car. [Specification: 7:11-8:28] The rear turning enhancement balance device comprises a rear guiding axis coupled from said left to said right of said car; [Specification, 7:18-19, FIG. 4 reference character 208] a rear weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said rear guiding axis equal to a length of said rear weighty drum such that said rear weighty drum is capable of moving along said rear guiding axis, said rear guiding axis confining motion of said rear weighty drum between said left and said right of said car, [Specification, FIG. 5 reference character 214, 7:20-23] said rear weighty drum having a third predefined resting position upon said rear guiding axis; [Specification, 7:13-15] and a rear recovery device tending to bias said rear weighty drum to said third predefined resting position. [Specification, 8:18-8:28]

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A. The Issues on Appeal

The issues on appeal and the specific pending claims to which each relates are:

1. Whether under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 are obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,614,126 ("Carlson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,501,167 ("Palowsky").

2. Whether under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 are obvious over Carlson in view of Palowsky as applied to claims 12 and 19, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,155,130 ("Hanel").

3. Whether under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) claims 23-25, 29, and 30 are obvious over Carlson in view of Palowsky as applied to claim 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,588,206 ("Powers").

VII. ARGUMENTS

A. Legal Standards for Obviousness

Claims 12-30 on appeal stand rejected as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) provides:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The Supreme Court has provided the following guidance in applying Section 103. In Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966), the Court stated:

> Under § 103, the scope and content of the prior art are to be determined; differences between the prior art and the claims at issue are to be ascertained; and the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art resolved. Against this background, the obviousness or nonobviousness of the subject matter is determined.

More recently, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the holdings of Graham, and clarified several aspects of the manner in which obviousness should be determined. KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., No. 04-1350 (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007). First, "[t]he combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results," but "when the prior art teaches away from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be nonobvious." Id. at 12. Second, "a patent composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art," id. at 14, rather, "it can be important to identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does, id. at 15." The Court recognized that many significant advances will combine familiar elements: "inventions in most, if not all, instances rely upon building blocks long since uncovered, and claimed discoveries almost of necessity will be combinations of what, in some sense, is already known." Id.

Following the decision in KSR Int'l, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") issued a memorandum to all Examiners. The memorandum directs Examiners to continue to determine why a person of ordinary skill in the art would make the combination: "in formulating a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed." Memorandum from USPTO, Supreme Court decision on KSR Int'l. Co., v. Teleflex, Inc., May 3, 2007, p. 2.

In addition, according to MPEP § 2141.02, Part VI, ("Prior Art Must Be Considered In Its Entirety, Including Disclosures That Teach Away From The Claims"), a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W. L. Gore & Associate, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.,* 721 F. 2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984)

Under these standards, Appellant's invention would not have been obvious. The Examiner has not identified prior art references, or a combination thereof, that disclose all the elements of the pending claims. Moreover, the required motivation to combine the cited references is not present, and instead Carlson and Palowsky teach away from their combination. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be reversed.

B. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

1. The Rejection of Claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky is Improper Because Carlson and Palowsky Teach Away from the Claims

a. U.S. Patent No. 3,614,126 to Carlson

Carlson discloses an apparatus for stabilizing and reducing the tendency of a vehicle to skid in response to transient forces that may be exerted upon the vehicle which consists of one or more masses adapted to be disposed upon the vehicle so that substantially universal pivotal movement of the center of gravity of the mass about a point may be realized as the vehicle is subjected to such transient forces. [Carlson, Abstract] In particular, Carlson teaches that a mass either moves in a lateral direction with respect to the car [Carlson, col. 1, lines 38-41] or that a resiliently mounted mass is provided with a means that serves to compensate for pitch, roll, and yaw of the vehicle. [Carlson, col. 1, lines 55-62]

Carlson teaches away from the claimed invention. Carlson teaches that a mass free to slide along a single axis, for example, by mounting a weight so that it is free to slide along a rod extending transversely between the rear wheels is *entirely ineffective for stabilizing the vehicle except with regard to the forces exerted along the axis in which it is free to move*. [Carlson, col. 1, lines 36-47] Carlson further teaches that stabilizing devices in which a weight is mounted for movement in slots vertically and laterally is *severely limited* with regard to external force vectors for which stabilization can be provided by the mass. [Carlson, col. 1, lines 48-54] Consequently, Carlson teaches a resiliently mounted mass provided with a means that serves to compensate for pitch, roll, and yaw of the vehicle *to overcome the above deficiencies* of a mass sliding along a rod. [Carlson, col. 1, lines 55-59]

On page 3 in the September 25, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner apparently referred to weight elements 63/65 in Carlson stating that the weight elements or drums are movable along an axis parallel to the front to rear axis of the vehicle, and that the drum will move toward the front of the motorcar when brakes of the motorcar are engaged while the motorcar is in motion, and the drum returns to the predefined resting position after the motorcar slows down or comes to a stop; the recovery device biases the drum to the predefined resting position. While the drums are biased to a predefined resting position, the Examiner is mistaken in stating that Carlson's drums only move along an axis parallel to the front to rear axis of the vehicle.

First, Carlson's patent discloses an apparatus consisting of one or more masses adapted to be disposed upon the vehicle so that *substantially universal pivotal movement of the center of gravity of the mass about a point may be realized* as the vehicle is subjected to such transient forces. [Carlson, Abstract] Thus, the embodiments described within the Carlson patent encompass this feature and necessarily move in a direction beyond a single axis.

Second, the Examiner refers to the embodiment of Carlson's invention shown in FIGS. 8-10 and described in col. 4, lines 7-48, which uses drums 63 and 65. Carlson states that the mass members 63 and 65 are supported on top of spring support means 61 and 68, where a suitable aperture extending downwardly form the interior of mass members 63 and 65 may take the form of the graduated opening shown in FIG.7. [Carlson, col. 4, lines 24-30] Note that the drums 63 and 65 are supported by spring support means 61 and 68. Spring support implies that the support is flexible and capable of bending and then returning to a resting position, not just acting like a stiff pendulum. In fact, Carlson states that the spring support material is capable of resilient deformation and assumes a generally S-shaped configuration, and the deformation is shown in FIG. 7. [Carlson, col. 3, lines 50-59] Further, as shown in FIG. 10 in Carlson, the arrow above the mass members 63 and 65 shows that the mass members move in a direction substantially laterally to the longitudinal direction of the stabilizer 55.

Thus, Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis, particularly in the longitudinal direction of the car.

b. U.S. Patent No. 3,501,167 to Palowsky

Palowsky teaches a vehicle stabilizer which is mounted in a substantially horizontal position on the rear end portion of the vehicle and *parallel to the rear axle*. [Palowsky, col. 1, lines 46-50] Palowsky further teaches that by forming a void in the upper portion of the weight, the center of gravity of the inertial mass becomes located below the longitudinal axis of the shaft. Thus, *the inertia of the mass is correspondingly displaced from the longitudinal axis of shaft 7 about which the weight 8 oscillates*, whereby the moment of inertia of the weight counteracts the front-to-rear pitching movement of the vehicle. [Palowsky, col. 2, lines 44-51]

Palowsky teaches away from the claimed invention. Palowsky teaches that stabilizers including a housing mounted parallel to the rear axle of the vehicle and containing a mass of inertia freely slidable therein but biased toward the medial portion of the housing by a spring positioned at each end of the mass *have disadvantages*. First, a relatively large heavy weight is required to counteract fishtailing. Second, *the stabilizer offers little or no counteraction to the front to rear pitching movements of the vehicle* which often accompanies fishtailing. [Palowsky, col. 1, lines 24-44]

Thus, Palowsky teaches away from a mass circumferentially surrounding a portion of a guiding axis capable of moving along a guiding axis oriented longitudinally along a car.

Moreover, because Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis, it is improper to combine Carson with Palowsky.

c. Claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, and 28

In stark contrast to Carlson and Palowsky, independent claims 12, 26, and 28 teach a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar. Because Carlson and Palowsky teach away from a weighty drum capable of moving along said guiding axis between the front and back of a car, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, claims 12, 26, and 28 are allowable over Carlson and Palowsky. Claims 13-16, 19, 20 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim and potentially for other reasons, as well. Thus, the rejection of claims 12, 14-16, 19, 20, 26, and 28 based upon the Carlson and Palowsky references should be overturned.

d. Claim 27

Also in stark contrast to Carlson and Palowsky, independent claim 27 teaches said braking buffer device operates to temporally transfer longitudinal momentum to a weighty drum that is biased to the rear of said motorcar when braking thereby tending to increase the comfort and safety of the car wherein said braking buffer device circumferentially surrounds a portion of a guiding axis equal to a length of said braking buffer device such that said braking buffer device is capable of moving along said guiding axis. Because Carlson and Palowsky teach away from a weighty drum capable of moving along said guiding axis between the front and back of a car, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, claim 27 is allowable over Carlson and Palowsky. Thus, the rejection of claim 27 based upon the Carlson and Palowsky references should be overturned.

2. The Rejection of Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky and further in view of Hanel is Improper

a. Claims 17, 18, 21, and 22

As discussed above, Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis; Palowsky teaches away from a mass circumferentially surrounding a portion of a guiding axis capable of moving along the guiding axis oriented parallel to the direction of travel of the car; and it is improper to combine Carlson and Palowsky.

Hanel teaches an anti-skidding device that is arranged transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle, preferably as far as possible behind the rear axle. [Hanel, col. 1, lines 43-45] Hanel is merely relied upon by the Examiner as teaching various means by which to provide a recovery function to the weight of a buffer device.

Because the cited references Carlson, Palowsky, and Hanel do not teach all of the essential elements of claims 17, 18, 21, and 22, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, Appellant urges the Board to overturn the rejection of claims 17, 18, 21, and 22.

3. The Rejection of Claims 23-25, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Carlson in view of Palowsky and further in view of Powers is Improper

a. Claims 23 and 24

As discussed above, Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis; Palowsky teaches away from a mass circumferentially surrounding a portion of a guiding axis capable of moving along the guiding axis oriented parallel to the direction of travel of the car; and it is improper to combine Carlson and Palowsky.

Powers teaches a vehicle stabilizer adapted to be secured transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle. [Powers, col. 1, lines 55-57] The stabilizer is mounted on a rear portion of the vehicle, and preferably rearwardly of the rear axle of the vehicle to be most effective. [Powers, col. 2, lines 43-36] The stabilizer has an inverted V-shaped hollow tubular housing for containing weights to counteract centrifugal forces on the vehicle and acts to *maintain the rear wheels of the vehicle in contact with the road surface*. [Powers, col. 1, lines 30-39] Powers teaches using two weights within the V-shaped housing positioned symmetrically with respect to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle [Powers, col. 1, lines 52-62, FIG. 5] in order to counteract tilting outwards of the rear portion of a vehicle body during a turn. [Powers, col. 4, lines 11- 61]

In contrast to Powers, claims 23 and 24 teach that said guiding axis is *tilted down towards said front of said motorcar*. The reason for tilting the guiding axis downwards toward the front of the car is to produce a downward component of force on the front and the rear wheels, but *most of the force is applied to the front wheels*, to increase frictional force and decrease the braking distance. Moreover, the guiding axis is a single straight tube oriented longitudinally with respect to the car, rather than a V-shaped tube oriented transversely. [Specification, 6:23-7:10]

Because the cited references Carlson, Palowsky, and Powers do not teach all of the essential elements of claims 23 and 24, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, Appellant urges the Board to overturn the rejection of claims 23 and 24.

b. Claims 29 and 30

As discussed above, Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis; Palowsky teaches away from a mass circumferentially surrounding a portion of a guiding axis capable of moving along the guiding axis oriented parallel to the direction of travel of the car; and it is improper to combine Carlson and Palowsky.

Powers teaches a vehicle stabilizer adapted to be secured transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle. [Powers, col. 1, lines 55-57] The stabilizer is mounted on a rear portion of the vehicle, and preferably rearwardly of the rear axle of the vehicle to be most effective. [Powers, col. 2, lines 43-36] The stabilizer has an inverted V-shaped hollow tubular housing for containing weights to counteract centrifugal forces on the vehicle and acts to *maintain the rear wheels of the vehicle in contact with the road surface*. [Powers, col. 1, lines 30-39] Powers teaches using two weights within the V-shaped housing positioned symmetrically with respect to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle [Powers, col. 1, lines 52-62, FIG. 5] in order to counteract tilting outwards of the rear portion of a vehicle body during a turn. [Powers, col. 4, lines 11- 61]

In contrast to Powers, claims 29 and 30 teach that said guiding axis is *tilted down towards said front of said motorcar*. The reason for tilting the guiding axis downwards toward the front of the car is to produce a downward component of force on the front and the rear wheels, but *most of the force is applied to the front wheels*, to increase frictional force and decrease the braking distance. Moreover, two guiding axes on the right and left sides of the car are used that are oriented longitudinally with respect to the car, rather than a single V-shaped tube oriented transversely [Specification, 6:23-7:10]

Because the cited references Carlson, Palowsky, and Powers do not teach all of the essential elements of claims 29 and 30, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, Appellant urges the Board to overturn the rejection of claims 29 and 30.

c. Claim 25

As discussed above, Carlson teaches away from a mass free to slide along a single axis; Palowsky teaches away from a mass circumferentially surrounding a portion of a guiding axis capable of moving along the guiding axis oriented parallel to the direction of travel of the car; and it is improper to combine Carlson and Palowsky.

Powers teaches a vehicle stabilizer adapted to be *secured transversely to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle*. [Powers, col. 1, lines 55-57] The stabilizer is mounted on a rear portion of the vehicle, and preferably rearwardly of the rear axle of the vehicle to be most effective. [Powers, col. 2, lines 43-36] The stabilizer has an inverted V-shaped hollow tubular housing for containing weights to counteract centrifugal forces on the vehicle and acts to maintain the rear wheels of the vehicle in contact with the road surface. [Powers, col. 1, lines 30-39] Powers teaches using two weights within the V-shaped housing positioned symmetrically with respect to the longitudinal axis of the vehicle [Powers, col. 1, lines 52-62, FIG. 5] in order to counteract tilting outwards of the rear portion of a vehicle body during a turn. [Powers, col. 4, lines 11- 61]

In contrast to Powers, claim 25 teaches that the weight drum is positioned towards said back of said motorcar, where the guiding axis is coupled form said front to said back of said motorcar. Moreover, the guiding axis is a single straight tube oriented longitudinally with respect to the car, rather than a V-shaped tube oriented transversely. [Specification, 6:23-7:10]

Because the cited references Carlson, Palowsky, and Powers do not teach all of the essential elements of claims 25, and it is improper to even combine Carlson and Palowsky, Appellant urges the Board to overturn the rejection of claim 25.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Appellant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and patentably define over the prior art, and urge the Board to overturn the Examiner's rejections.

Dated: April 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Lisa Liou

Lisa W. Liou
Registration No.: 54,275
PERKINS COIE LLP
101 Jefferson Drive
Menlo Park, California 94025
(650) 838-4300
(650) 838-4350 (Fax)
Attorneys for Applicant

CLAIMS APPENDIX

Claims Involved in the Appeal of Application Serial No. 10/679,051.

12. A braking buffer device for a motorcar having a front and a back, said braking buffer device intended to provide a more comfortable braking experience for passengers of said motorcar, said braking buffer device comprising:

a guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said motorcar;

a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar, said weighty drum having a predefined resting position upon said guiding axis wherein said weighty drum moves toward said front of said motorcar when brakes of said motorcar are engaged while said motorcar is in motion and said weighty drum returns to said predefined resting position after said motorcar slows down or comes to a stop; and

a recovery device tending to bias said weighty drum to said predefined resting position.

13. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said guiding axis is coupled to an underside of said motorcar.

14. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 13 further comprising a supporting frame, said supporting frame coupled to said underbody of said automobile, said supporting frame enclosing said guiding axis, said weighty drum, and said recovery device.

15. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 14, wherein said supporting frame is a substantially hollow cylindrical body.

16. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said recovery device includes a coiled spring.

17. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said recovery device includes a pneumatic device.

18. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said recovery device includes elastic rubber.

19. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12 further comprising a buffer device for buffering and noise absorption during a recovery cycle of said weighty drum.

20. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 19, wherein said buffer device includes a spring.

21. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 19, wherein said buffer device includes a pneumatic device.

22. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 19, wherein said buffer device includes elastic rubber.

23. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said guiding axis is tilted down towards said front of said motorcar.

24. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 23, wherein said tilt of said guiding axis is between about 1 and 4 degrees.

25. A braking buffer device as recited in claim 12, wherein said predefined resting position of said weight drum is positioned towards said back of said motorcar.

26. A braking buffer device for a motorcar having a front and a back, said braking buffer device intended to provide a more comfortable braking experience for passengers of said motorcar, said braking buffer device comprising:

a guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said motorcar, said guiding axis being tilted downward towards said front of said motorcar;

a weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said guiding axis equal to a length of said weighty drum such that said weighty drum is capable of moving along said guiding axis, said guiding axis confining motion of said weighty drum between said front and said back of said motorcar, said weighty drum having a predefined resting position upon said guiding axis positioned towards said back of said motorcar; and

a recovery device tending to bias said weighty drum to said predefined resting position.

27. A braking buffer device for a motorcar travelling in a longitudinal direction, said braking buffer device characterized in that said braking buffer device operates to temporally transfer longitudinal momentum to a weighty drum that is biased to the rear of said motorcar when braking thereby tending to increase the comfort and safety of the car wherein said braking buffer device circumferentially surrounds a portion of a guiding axis equal to a length of said braking buffer device such that said braking buffer device is capable of moving along said guiding axis.

28. A car suitable for the transportation of passengers and cargo, said car having a front and a back and a left and a right, said car comprising:

a left braking buffer device including:

a left guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car;

a left weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said left guiding axis equal to a length of said left weighty drum such that said left weighty drum is capable of moving along said left guiding axis, said left guiding axis confining motion of said left weighty drum between said front and said back of said car, said left weighty drum having a first predefined resting position upon said left guiding axis; and

a left recovery device tending to bias said left weighty drum to said first predefined resting position;

a right braking buffer device including:

a right guiding axis coupled from said front to said back of said car;

a right weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said right guiding axis equal to a length of said right weighty drum such that said right weighty drum is capable of moving along said right guiding axis, said right guiding axis confining motion of said right weighty drum between said front and said back of said car, said right weighty drum having a second predefined resting position upon said right guiding axis; and

a right recovery device tending to bias said right weighty drum to said second predefined resting position;

a rear turning enhancement balance device, said rear turning enhancement device intended to decrease centrifugal motion of front wheels of said car and the momentum of the weighty drum enhances the turning of said car, including:

a rear guiding axis coupled from said left to said right of said car;

a rear weighty drum circumferentially surrounding a portion of said rear guiding axis equal to a length of said rear weighty drum such that said rear weighty drum is capable of moving along said rear guiding axis, said rear guiding axis confining motion of said rear weighty drum between said left and said right of said car, said rear weighty drum having a third predefined resting position upon said rear guiding axis; and

a rear recovery device tending to bias said rear weighty drum to said third predefined resting position.

29. A car as recited in claim 28, wherein said left and right guiding axes in said left and right braking buffer devices are tilted downward towards said front of said car at a guiding axis tilt.

30. A car as recited in claim 29, wherein said guiding axis tilt is between about 1 and 4 degrees.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the Examiner is being submitted.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.